REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-21 and 22-26 are currently pending.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,535,199 to Amri et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,618,397 to Huang. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have fully described Amri and argued the differences between the claims and the cited references in the Amendment mailed on October 29, 2007. Applicants repeat and incorporate those statements here. In this response, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination still fails to disclose the claimed transmitting unit that concatenates a compressed RTP header and a compressed UDP header with the new TCP header. By concatenating the compressed RTP header and the compressed UDP header with the new TCP header, the present invention links the compressed RTP header and the compressed UDP header into the new TCP header so that the TCP packet can send the other headers. In other words, the claimed invention includes three headers. There is the new TCP header generated by the transmitting unit. In addition, there are the compressed RTP header and the compressed UDP header that are concatenating with that new TCP header.

According to the Office Action, Huang discloses the transmitting unit encapsulating, or concatenating, the compressed RTP header and the compressed UCP header with the new TCP header. Applicants respectfully submit that Huang and Amri both do not disclose this combination. As stated in the Office Action, Huang discloses encapsulating a TCP header with a UDP header. Huang does not disclose encapsulating a TCP header with more than one header, nor with even one compressed header. Moreover, Huang does not disclose concatenating a header with more than one header when each of the concatenating headers is of different compressed protocols.

Huang is directed to a group packet encapsulation and compression system and method. Huang includes an encapsulation protocol that increases packet transmission performance between two gateways or host computers by reducing data-link layer

framing overheard, reducing packet routing overhead in gateways, compressing packet headers in the encapsulation packet, and increasing loss-less data compression ratio. Packets queued at a node are classified, grouped, and encapsulated into a single packet as a function of having another such configuration node in their path.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references including Huang disclose a compression method of sending an uncompressed header first in order to provide the starting point for compressed headers. By itself, this concept disclosed by the cited references including Huang is not unique and is a key part of Van Jacobsen and most compression schemes. Applicants' claims, while using the technique, concatenates two compressed headers in order to transport through a cellular data network. Applicants note that the claims are mainly applicable to cellular data networks that are bandwidth limited. The invention takes advantage of the PDSN nodes in the network to do TCP/IP compression and routing while not processing the UDP/RTP part of the headers. Compression schemes in other network like cable data and X.25 do not have these constraints or architecture.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Amri and Huang do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest amended claim 1 as they do not disclose the step of the transmitting unit concatenating the compressed UDP and the compressed RTP packet with a new TCP a packet. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Amri and Sen. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073227 A1 to Bunn et al.; claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and Bunn and further in view of Jacobson; claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang, Bunn and Jacobson and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0030963 A1 to Yoshimura et al. and United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/071096 to Na et al.; claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and Bunn and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,158,491 B1 to Le; claims 8 and 9 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and Bunn and further in view of Yoshimura; claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang, Bunn and Yoshimura and further in view of Sen; claim 11-12 and 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and further in view of Yoshimura; claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and Yoshimura and further in view of Jacobson; claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and Yoshimura and further in view of Sen; claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang, Yoshimura and Sen and further in view of Na; claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang, Yoshimura and Sen and further in view of Jacobson; claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0081151 A1 to Gries et al.; claim 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amri in view of Huang and further in view of Na. Claims 2-21 and 23-26 depend upon and include the limitation of amended independent claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 2-21 and 23-26 are patentable over the various cited combinations for the reasons given above for claim 1 as it overcomes the combination of Amri and Huang. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-21 and 23-26 are patentable over the combinations. Applicants request that these rejections under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-2117**.

Respectfully submitted,
Hector Ricardo Davila, et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750